

**From:** Huitric, Michele [Huitric.Michele@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 4/11/2018 4:29:38 PM  
**To:** Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]; Fairbanks, Brianna [Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Harris-Bishop, Rusty [Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov]; Huitric, Michele [Huitric.Michele@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: Media query - Inside EPA - Hunters Point media query

Thanks for your input, Brianna. I made some tweaks to the response highlighted yellow; please see what you think.

John – please also take a look at the proposed response below, and let us know of any edits/concerns. Reporter's deadline is Friday, April 13. Thanks!

Inside EPA reporter Suzanne Yohannan has sent questions about PEER's press release about HPNS. In her email, reporter said:

[My questions] relate to the recent spate of documents EPA released via FOIA to the group PEER about the Hunters Point cleanup. These include a Dec. 27 letter from Region 9's John Chesnutt to the Navy saying, "EPA, DTSC, and CDPH found signs of potential falsification, data manipulation, and/or data quality concerns that call into question the reliability of soil data in an additional 76% of survey units, bringing to 90% the total suspect soil survey units in Parcel B" at Hunters Point. "In Parcel G, the Navy recommended resampling 49% of survey units, and regulatory agencies recommended 49% more, for a total of 97% of survey units as suspect." These related to soil sampling that contractor Tetra Tech had done at the site.

**Q1. Has EPA followed-up with the Navy -- is it requiring the Navy to re-take samples on 90 percent and 97 percent of those parcels to see if additional cleanup is needed before land transfer?**

**Response:** EPA is pleased that the Navy will be resampling the impacted parcels and relying on these new data to determine where additional cleanup may be needed. EPA's input, which is based on our independent review of the data, will help inform where the resampling will be done. The final plan for resampling is not yet complete, though the Navy has committed to resampling 100% of the survey units previously sampled by Tetra Tech.

**Q2. Who will be re-taking any samples? Is it the same contractor, Tetra Tech, or someone else?**

**Response:** The Navy is using a third-party independent contractor; Tetra Tech will not be involved in this effort. EPA and the state regulators will be overseeing this process and taking split samples for independent analysis.

**Q3. When will EPA be done with reviewing the other parcels at Hunters Point to see if the Navy was correct in determining how much of the sampling has signs of potential falsification, etc.?**

**Response:** EPA sent the Navy the results of our independent review of Parcels B and G on December 29, 2017 and of Parcels D-2, UC-1, UC-2, and UC-3 on March 30, 2018. There will be additional reports to review for Parcel C, D-1, and E. You may want to check with the Navy regarding timing for the additional reports; here is the contact information for their press officer: William Franklin, U.S. Navy Public Affairs Officer, (619) 524-5433.

**Q4. Is EPA investigating the use of Tetra Tech in cleanup contractors elsewhere, either in Region 9 or across the country? If so, can you offer details on when that investigation was launched and what it entails?**

**Response:** Any ongoing investigation by EPA would be of a confidential nature and therefore not something we could discuss.

**Q5. Does EPA have any explanation for the discrepancy between EPA and the Navy over the review of sampling? Why such a difference in findings?**

**Response:** Please see the attached report for EPA's findings from our independent review of Parcels B and G soil sample data. In regards to the discrepancy in the percentages, EPA's assessment of the data included looking more closely for signs of potential data quality problems in addition to signs of potential falsification. For example, EPA recommended

resampling when data were missing or when different data collection methods did not produce consistent results. Please let us know if you have any specific questions about the report.

---

**From:** Fairbanks, Brianna  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 11:56 AM  
**To:** Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Media query - Inside EPA - Hunters Point media query

Responses noted below.

**Brianna Fairbanks**

Attorney/Advisor  
EPA Region 9  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 972-3907

---

**From:** Huitric, Michele  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 10, 2018 11:46 AM  
**To:** Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Harris-Bishop, Rusty <Harris-Bishop.Rusty@epa.gov>; Huitric, Michele <Huitric.Michele@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** Media query - Inside EPA - Hunters Point media query

Note - let's finish Chris Roberts' questions first and then address this new query from Inside EPA.

Inside EPA reporter Suzanne Yohannan has sent questions about PEER's press release about HPNS; her deadline is Friday, April 13.  
I've have pulled together some draft responses below.

Note, in her email, reporter said:

[My questions] relate to the recent spate of documents EPA released via FOIA to the group PEER about the Hunters Point cleanup. These include a Dec. 27 letter from Region 9's John Chesnutt to the Navy saying, "EPA, DTSC, and CDPH found signs of potential falsification, data manipulation, and/or data quality concerns that call into question the reliability of soil data in an additional 76% of survey units, bringing to 90% the total suspect soil survey units in Parcel B" at Hunters Point. "In Parcel G, the Navy recommended resampling 49% of survey units, and regulatory agencies recommended 49% more, for a total of 97% of survey units as suspect." These related to soil sampling that contractor Tetra Tech had done at the site.

**Q1. Has EPA followed-up with the Navy -- is it requiring the Navy to re-take samples on 90 percent and 97 percent of those parcels to see if additional cleanup is needed before land transfer?**

**Response:** EPA is pleased that the Navy will be resampling the impacted parcels and relying on these new data to determine where additional cleanup may be needed. EPA's input, which is based on our independent review of the data, will help inform where the resampling will be done. The final plan for resampling is not yet complete, though the Navy has committed to resampling 100% of the survey units previously sampled by Tetra Tech. [The Navy has stated publicly

that they intend to do resampling on 100% of the survey units; it is the level and type of sampling that is now under debate].

**Q2. Who will be re-taking any samples? Is it the same contractor, Tetra Tech, or someone else?**

**Response:** The Navy is using a third-party independent contractor. Tetra Tech will not be involved in this effort. EPA and the state regulators will be overseeing this process and taking split samples for independent analysis. [is this right? – yes, and we will have our own contractors on site]

**Q3. When will EPA be done with reviewing the other parcels at Hunters Point to see if the Navy was correct in determining how much of the sampling has signs of potential falsification, etc.?**

**Response:** EPA sent the Navy the results of our independent review of Parcels B and G on December 29, 2017 and of Parcels D-2, UC-1, UC-2, and UC-3 on March 30, 2018. Will there be other data reports that we will review? Timing? There will be additional reports for Parcel C, D-1, and E, which we have not reviewed yet. I am not sure on timing, though we could refer the reporter to the Navy for that.

**Q4. Is EPA investigating the use of Tetra Tech in cleanup contractors elsewhere, either in Region 9 or across the country? If so, can you offer details on when that investigation was launched and what it entails?**

**Response:** Any ongoing investigation by EPA would be of a confidential nature and therefore not something we could discuss.

**Q5. Does EPA have any explanation for the discrepancy between EPA and the Navy over the review of sampling? Why such a difference in findings?**

**Response:** Please see the attached report for EPA's findings from our independent review of Parcels B and G soil sample data. In regards to the discrepancy in the percentages, EPA's assessment of the data included looking more closely for signs of potential data quality problems in addition to signs of potential falsification. For example, EPA recommended resampling when data were missing or when different data collection methods did not produce consistent results. Please let us know if you have any specific questions about the report.